

### REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Villanueva et al* (US 2005/0030718) in view of *Bright et al.* (US 5,241,453). Claims 3, 7-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Villanueva et al.* (US 2005/0030718) in view of *Bright et al.* (US 5,241,453) as applied to the above claims, and further in view of *Ma* (US 6,791,847). These rejections are not applicable to the claims.

The independent claims include: "the resilient load member having an opening formed therein permitting the processor to extend through the opening into contact with the heat sink, whereby the resilient load member urges the processor into contact with the socket without applying a force to the heat sink."

In *Bright*, the spring 20 engages the heat sink 18 and the socket member 14 and urges the socket member upwardly to sandwich the processor 16 between the heat sink 18 and the socket member, see Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 17-41.

In the present invention, the spring 50 urges only the processor 12 downwardly into engagement with the socket 104, see Fig. 12 and paragraphs [0025] – [0026]. The spring imposes no load on the heat sink. An opening in the spring permits the heat sink to engage the processor without any load being applied by the spring.

As the PTO recognizes in MPEP §2142:

The Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness. If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness.

The USPTO clearly cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in connection with the amended claims for the following reasons.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) provides that:

[a] patent may not be obtained ... if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains ... (emphasis added)

Thus, when evaluating a claim for determining obviousness, all limitations of the claim must be evaluated. However, the references, alone, or in combination, do not teach the resilient load member having an opening formed therein permitting the processor to extend through the opening into contact with the heat sink, whereby the resilient load member urges the processor into contact with the socket without applying a force to the heat sink.

Therefore, it is impossible to render the subject matter of the claims as a whole obvious based on a single reference or any combination of the references, and the above explicit terms of the statute cannot be met. As a result, the USPTO's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness clearly cannot be met with respect to the claims, and a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is not applicable.

There is still another compelling, and mutually exclusive, reason why the references cannot be combined and applied to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The PTO also provides in MPEP §2142:

[T]he Examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical "person of ordinary skill in the art" when the invention was unknown and just before it was made. In view of all factual information, the Examiner must then make a determination whether the claimed invention "as a whole" would have been obvious at that time to that person. ...[I]mpermissible hindsight must be avoided and the legal conclusion must be reached on the basis of the facts gleaned from the prior art.

Here, the references do not teach, or even suggest, the desirability of the combination because neither teaches or suggests providing the resilient load member having an opening formed therein permitting the processor to extend through the opening into contact with the heat sink, whereby the resilient load member urges the processor into contact with the socket without applying a force to the heat sink.

Thus, neither of these references provides any incentive or motivation supporting the desirability of the combination. Therefore, there is simply no basis in the art for combining the references to support a 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of the claims.

In this context, the MPEP further provides at §2143.01:

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. (emphasis in original)

In the above context, the courts have repeatedly held that obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. In the present case it is clear that the USPTO's combination arises solely from hindsight based on the invention without any showing, suggestion, incentive or motivation in either reference for the combination as applied to the claims. Therefore, for this mutually exclusive reason, the USPTO's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness clearly cannot be met with respect to the claims, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is not applicable.

In view of all of the above, the allowance of claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-18 and 20-21 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Bell  
Registration No. 26,528

Dated: 5-18-06  
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789  
Telephone: 512/867-8407  
Facsimile: 214/200-0853  
ipdocketing@haynesboone.com